arXiv:1610.01689v1 [math.NT] 5 Oct 2016

MOONSHINE MODULES AND A QUESTION OF GRIESS

VICTOR MANUEL ARICHETA AND LEA BENEISH

Abstract. We consider the situation in which a finite group acts on an infinite-dimensional graded module in such a way that the graded-trace functions are weakly holomorphic modular forms. Under some mild hypotheses we completely describe the asymptotic module structure of the homogeneous subspaces. As a consequence we find that moonshine for a group gives rise to partial orderings on its irreducible representations. This serves as a first answer to a question posed by Griess.

1. Moonshine and Statement of Results

In mathematics, the term moonshine is used to reference a situation in which distinguished modular or mock modular forms serve as graded trace functions for the action of a finite group on some infinite-dimensional module. Conway and Norton introduced this word to mathematics in the late 1970s when they coined the phrase *monstrous moonshine* to describe the unexpected connection between the Monster group $\mathbb{M}$ and the modular j-invariant [7].

The theory began with McKay's observation that the first coefficient of the normalized modular j-invariant

$$J(\tau) := q^{-1} + 196884q + 21493760q^2 + \cdots \qquad (q := e^{2\pi i\tau})$$

is the sum of dimensions of irreducible representations of $\mathbb{M}$ (i.e. $196884 = 196883+1$). Thompson extended this observation to other coefficients and conjectured the existence of a graded infinite-dimensional $\mathbb{M}$-module

$$V^\natural = V_{-1}^\natural \oplus V_1^\natural \oplus V_2^\natural \oplus \cdots,$$

such that the graded dimension function $\sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \dim(V_n^\natural)\, q^n$ is precisely the modular function $J(\tau)$ and further that the other graded trace functions are distinguished modular functions [19]. Conway and Norton made this precise in what is known as the monstrous moonshine conjecture which postulates that the graded trace functions are also modular functions for certain specific genus zero subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ [7].Borcherds proved the monstrous moonshine conjecture in 1992, using the theory of vertex operator algebras and generalized Kac-Moody algebras [1]. Even after Borcherds' proof, it was generally agreed that "the real nature of moonshine is still remote" [8].

In 2010, string theorists Eguchi, Ooguri, and Tachikawa discovered a new moonshine phenomenon [11]. They had been studying the elliptic genus of a K3 surface when they discovered a connection between the largest Mathieu group M_{24} and a certain mock modular form $H(\tau)$. In analogy to the monstrous moonshine conjecture, Mathieu moonshine is the assertion that there is a naturally defined graded infinite-dimensional M_{24}-module $K^\natural := \oplus_n K_n^\natural$ such that $H(\tau)$ is the graded trace function for $K^\natural$. If this were true, then one could build the graded trace functions.

A number of authors — Cheng [4] , Gaberdiel, Hohenegger, and Volpatto [12, 13], Eguchi and Hikami [11] — calculated what these functions should be. Similar to $H(\tau)$, they are mock modular forms, and in some cases, even modular. Gannon proved that $K^\natural$ exists and has graded trace functions which are mock modular forms [14].

Umbral moonshine is a generalization of Mathieu moonshine. It is a compendium of 23 instances of moonshine relating finite groups and (vector-valued) mock modular forms (see Section 4) and was discovered by Cheng, Duncan, and Harvey [3]. In 2015, Duncan, Griffin, and Ono proved the umbral moonshine conjecture using the process of holomorphic projection [10]. The discovery of Mathieu moonshine and umbral moonshine brought a change in perspective in moonshine: mock modular forms were introduced to the theory and weight 1/2 forms gained attention.

Duncan, Griffin, and Ono revisited monstrous moonshine and explored the structure of the homogeneous subspaces V_n [9]. They found that as $n \to \infty$, the subspaces V_n tend to a multiple of the regular representation. More precisely, let $M_1, \ldots, M_{194}$ be the irreducible representations of $\mathbb{M}$ and write

$$V_n = \mathrm{m}_1(n)M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathrm{m}_{194}(n)M_{194}.$$

They showed that

$$\mathrm{m}_i(n) \sim \frac{e^{4\pi\sqrt{n}}}{\sqrt{2}|\mathbb{M}|n^{3/4}} \dim \chi_i$$

where χ_i is the irreducible character associated to M_i. To show this, they derived an exact series formula for $\mathrm{m}_i(n)$, and the asymptotic above is obtained by isolating the dominant term of the series. In view of this result, Griess posed the following question (cf. Problem 10.9. in [9]):

> **Griess' Question.** *If we write each homogeneous subspace of each moonshine module, particularly the moonshine module $V^\natural$, as the sum of a free part (free over the group ring of $\mathbb{M}$) and a non-free part, then the non-free part tends to 0 (relative to the free part) as $n \to \infty$. Is there something to be learnt from an analysis of the non-free parts?*

Towards this, Larson characterized the multiplicities of the irreducible representations in the non-free part of V_n [15]. In her analysis, she obtained an explicit ordering of conjugacy classes of $\mathbb{M}$ based on their contributions to the multiplicities $\mathrm{m}_i(n)$. It turns out that after the conjugacy class 1A, the class with the next biggest contribution to the multiplicity function is 2A, and therefore, 2A dictates the asymptotic for the multiplicity functions of the non-free part. This asymptotic formula shows that the non-free part tends to a representation of G whose irreducible components do not include M_{16} and M_{17}.

In this paper, we extend Larson's analysis to take into consideration all of the conjugacy classes. We also consider this problem in a more general setting. This applies in particular to Mathieu moonshine and umbral moonshine.

By abstracting only the features of Mathieu moonshine necessary for our analysis, we are able to ease calculations by avoiding complicated specific formulas. This approach also has the added benefit of finding necessary conditions on the representation theory of a group in order for a moonshine of the kind we consider to occur. Thus, we will be interested in a group G satisfying the following:

(i) to each conjugacy class $[g]$ of G, there is an associated power series $H_g(\tau)$ with expansion
$$H_g(\tau) = q^\kappa \sum_{n \geq -1} c_g(n) q^n$$
where $0 \leq \kappa < 1$ and $c_g(n) \in \mathbb{Z}$;

(ii) there is a graded infinite-dimensional G-module
$$K = K_{-1} \oplus K_0 \oplus K_1 \oplus \cdots$$
such that
$$H_g(\tau) = q^\kappa \sum_{n \geq -1} \operatorname{tr}(g|K_n) q^n;$$

(iii) and the power series coefficients satisfy
$$c_g(n) = \operatorname{sgn}(c_g(n)) C_{n,g} \exp\left(\frac{D_n}{\operatorname{ord}(g)}\right) + o\left(\exp\left(\frac{D_n}{\operatorname{ord}(g)}\right)\right)$$
for some algebraic functions $C_{n,g}, D_n > 0$ independent of the order of g, and where $\operatorname{sgn}(c_g(n))$ is periodic with period p_g.

In Mathieu moonshine, the power series $H_g^{(M_{24})}$ are mock modular forms. Cheng and Duncan showed that these mock modular forms are expressible as Rademacher sums (cf. Section 5 for more details), and thus, have coefficients given by an exact formula [6]. A more general treatment of exact formulas for coefficients for harmonic Maass forms is given by Bringmann and Ono in [2]. From here, one can deduce that the coefficient $c_g^{(M_{24})}(n)$ satisfies:
$$c_g^{(M_{24})}(n) = \operatorname{sgn}(c_g(n)) \frac{4}{n_g^{1/2}\sqrt{8n-1}} \exp\left(\frac{\pi\sqrt{8n-1}}{2n_g}\right) + o\left(\exp\left(\frac{\pi\sqrt{8n-1}}{2n_g}\right)\right)$$
where n_g is the level of the mock modular form $H_g^{(M_{24})}$. Now, the level n_g is equal to the order of g in M_{24}, and this is where condition (iii) comes from. Note that in general — for example, in monstrous moonshine [15] — the level may not be necessarily equal to the order of the corresponding element. But this does not affect the essence of Theorem 1.2 as seen in its proof, and so we assume condition (iii) because it simplifies the analysis.

Our first theorem states that these assumptions imply that the homogeneous subspaces K_n tend to the regular representation of G as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let e be the identity element in G, and let $M_1, \ldots, M_s$ be the irreducible representations of G, and let $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_s$ be the associated irreducible characters, respectively. Write*
$$K_n = m_1(n)M_1 \oplus m_2(n)M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus m_s(n)M_s.$$
Then
$$m_i(n) \sim C_{n,e} \exp(\mathrm{D_n}) \dim \chi_\mathrm{i}.$$
where $C_{n,e}$ and D_n are as in assumption (iii) in the introduction and therefore,
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{m_i(n)}{\sum_{j=1}^s m_j(n)} = \frac{\dim \chi_i}{\sum_{j=1}^s \dim \chi_j}.$$

Therefore it makes sense to consider Griess' question in this more general setting. In Section 3, we analyze the non-free part of K_n and from this analysis, we find:

Theorem 1.2. *There is a natural decomposition of the subspace K_n as follows:*

$$K_n = r_1(n)L_1(n) \oplus r_2(n)L_2(n) \oplus \cdots \oplus r_t(n)L_t(n) \oplus L_\epsilon(n), \tag{1.1}$$

where $r_1(n), \ldots, r_t(n)$ are nonnegative integer-valued (unbounded) functions, $L_1(n)$, ..., $L_t(n)$ are representations of G, and $L_\epsilon(n)$ is a representation of G with bounded multiplicity functions.

Moreover, let p_g be as in condition (iii) in the introduction, and set $N = lcm\{p_g : g \in G\}$. Fix $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then for $n \equiv n_0 \pmod N$ large enough, if $L_j(n)$ decomposes into irreducible representations M_i of G for $i \in X_j \subseteq \{1, \ldots, s\}$, then $L_{j+1}(n)$ decomposes into irreducible representations M_i of G for $i \in X_{j+1} \subsetneq X_j$.

The representation $L_1(n)$ here is always equal to the regular representation and Theorem 1.1 shows that K_n tends to a multiple of $L_1(n)$. The proof shows that this fact is obtained by only looking at the contribution of the identity element in G. The representations $L_j(n)$ are natural analogues of the regular representation, whose structures are determined by the parameters in assumption (iii).

Our result shows that these representations $L_j(n)$'s have a curious property that they are expressed in terms of fewer and fewer irreducible representations of G. In other words, by looking at the sequence $L_1(n), L_2(n), \ldots$, we find that the irreducible representations disappear in some order. Thus we find that moonshine for a group naturally equips its irreducible representations with partial orders. This is the part that speaks to Griess' question.

Example 1.3. There is a copy of A_5 in M_{24} such that the fusion of conjugacy classes gives us an infinite-dimensional graded representation of A_5, say

$$K^{(A_5)} = K_{-1} \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus \cdots,$$

with graded trace functions

$$\begin{aligned} H_{1A}^{(A_5)} &= H_{1A}^{(M_{24})} \\ H_{2A}^{(A_5)} &= H_{2A}^{(M_{24})} \\ H_{3A}^{(A_5)} &= H_{3A}^{(M_{24})} \\ H_{5A}^{(A_5)} &= H_{5A}^{(M_{24})} \\ H_{5B}^{(A_5)} &= H_{5A}^{(M_{24})}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $n \equiv 10 \pmod{30}$. Then as $n \to \infty$, the discussion in Section 3 shows that K_n naturally decomposes into

$$K_n = r_1(n)L_1(n) \oplus r_2(n)L_2(n) \oplus r_3(n)L_3(n) \oplus L_\epsilon(n)$$

where $L_1(n)$ is the regular representation, $L_2(n)$ is a representation whose irreducible decomposition is in terms of M_1, M_3 and M_5, $L_3(n)$ is a representation whose irreducible decomposition is in terms of M_1 and M_5, and L_ϵ have bounded multiplicity functions. Hence, moonshine on A_5 gives us the ordering of (blocks of) irreducible modules: $\{M_2, M_3\}$, followed by $\{M_4\}$, and then by $\{M_1, M_5\}$.

Griess' question is open ended, and the quantitative answer we offer is one of the many partial answers to this problem. In fact, when Griess posed the problem, the original intention was to know whether a complete understanding of the asymptotics could provide clues to a richer algebraic structure surrounding the group and the graded module for it.

In the course of proving Theorem 1.2, the asymptotics for the multiplicities of the irreducible components of the non-free parts of K_n are easily obtained.

Theorem 1.4. *Let e_2 be the least order of a non-identity conjugacy class of G, and let h be an element of order e_2. Let K'_n be the non-free part of K_n and write*

$$K'_n = m'_1(n)M_1 \oplus m'_2(n)M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus m'_s(n)M_s.$$

Then

$$m'_i(n) \sim \frac{C_{n,h}\exp(\mathrm{D_n}/\mathrm{e_2})}{|G|} \sum_{[g],\ order\ e_2} |[g]| f'_i(g)\mathrm{sgn}(\mathrm{c_g(n)})$$

where $C_{n,h}$ and D_n are as in condition (iii) in the introduction and

$$f'_i(g) := \chi_i(g) - \frac{\dim \chi_i}{\dim \chi_{j'}}\chi_{j'}(g)$$

with j' being a j that minimizes

$$\frac{\sum\limits_{g,\ order\ e_2} |[g]|\chi_j(g)\mathrm{sgn}(\mathrm{c_g(n)})}{\dim \chi_j}.$$

We use this to obtain the asymptotics of these multiplicities in the M_{24} case, which we record here as a corollary.

Corollary 1.5. Let K'_n be the non-free part of $K_n^{(M_{24})}$ and write

$$K'_n = \mathrm{m}'_1(n)M_1 \oplus \mathrm{m}'_2(n)M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathrm{m}'_{26}(n)M_{26}.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{m}'_i(n) \sim (-1)^{n+1}\frac{\sqrt{2}\, e^{\frac{\pi}{4}\sqrt{8n-1}}}{\sqrt{8n-1}} \left(\frac{|2A|}{|M_{24}|}\left(\chi_i(2A) - \frac{\chi_j(2A)}{\dim\chi_j}\dim\chi_i\right) - \frac{|2B|}{|M_{24}|}\left(\chi_i(2B) - \frac{\chi_j(2B)}{\dim\chi_j}\dim\chi_i\right)\right)$$

where $j = 1$ if n is even and $j = 2$ if n is odd.

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank John Duncan and Ken Ono for suggesting the problem and for their indispensable advice and guidance throughout the process. The authors would also like to thank Hannah Larson for helpful conversations.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We have a graded representation

$$K = K_{-1} \oplus K_0 \oplus K_1 \oplus \cdots,$$

and the associated power series

$$H_g(\tau) = q^{\kappa} \sum_{n \geq -1} c_g(n) q^n$$

where the coefficients of H_e give us the sum of dimensions of irreducible representations of G. Let M_i be the irreducible representations of G, ordered in increasing dimension, and let χ_i be the corresponding irreducible characters. Let $\mathrm{m}_i(n)$ be the multiplicity of M_i in K_n so that

$$K_n = \mathrm{m}_1(n)M_1 \oplus \mathrm{m}_2(n)M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathrm{m}_s(n)M_s.$$

We define

$$H_{\chi_i}(\tau) := \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\overline{\chi_i(g)}H_g(\tau). \tag{2.1}$$

The following orthogonality of characters

$$\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\overline{\chi_i(g)}\chi_j(g) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \chi_i = \chi_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

implies that

$$\sum_{\chi}\overline{\chi_i(g)}\chi_i(h) = \begin{cases} |C_G(g)| & \text{if } g \text{ and } h \text{ are conjugate} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $|C_G(g)|$ is the order of the centralizer of g in G. Combining this with the expression for H_{χ_i} gives

$$H_g(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{s}\chi_i(g)H_{\chi_i}(\tau)$$

where in particular, we have $H_e(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{s}\dim(\chi_i)H_{\chi_i}(\tau)$. So we see that the multiplicities $\mathrm{m}_i(n)$ are Fourier coefficients of $H_{\chi_i}(\tau) = \sum_{n\geq 0}\mathrm{m}_i(n)q^n$. The nth coefficient of H_{χ_i} is given by

$$\mathrm{m}_i(n) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\chi_i(g)c_g(n) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C}}|[g]|\chi_i(g)c_g(n),$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the collection of conjugacy classes of G. By assumption (iii) in the introduction the power series coefficients satisfy

$$c_g(n) = \mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n))C_{n,g}\exp\left(\frac{D_n}{\mathrm{ord}(g)}\right) + o\left(\exp\left(\frac{D_n}{\mathrm{ord}(g)}\right)\right).$$

Thus we see that the formula for $\mathrm{m}_i(n)$ is dominated by the term corresponding to $g = e$. We thus get the following asymptotic for the multiplicities

$$\mathrm{m}_i(n) \sim \dim\chi_i C_{n,e}\exp\left(D_n\right).$$

3. Proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

From the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\mathrm{m}_i(n) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\chi_i(g)c_g(n) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C}}|[g]|\chi_i(g)c_g(n).$$

Let $L_1(n)$ be the regular representation and decompose K_n into the direct sum of representations

$$K_n = r_1(n)L_1(n)\oplus K_n^{(1)}$$

where $r_1(n)$ is a nonnegative integer which is as large as possible (so that $K_n^{(1)}$ is the non-free part of K_n). Let $1 = e_1 < e_2 < \cdots$ be the distinct orders of conjugacy

classes of G. Then by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(n) &:= \min_{1\le j\le s}\left\{\left\lfloor\frac{\mathrm{m}_j(n)}{\dim\chi_j}\right\rfloor\right\} \\ &= \min_{1\le j\le s}\left\{\left\lfloor\frac{1}{|G|}\left(c_e(n)+\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_2}\frac{|[g]|\chi_j(g)c_g(n)}{\dim\chi_j}\right.\right.\right. \\ &\qquad\left.\left.\left.+\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order }>e_2}\frac{|[g]|\chi_j(g)c_g(n)}{\dim\chi_j}\right)\right\rfloor\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the coefficients $c_g(n)$ corresponding to elements g of order $> e_2$ have a smaller order of growth than the coefficients corresponding to elements of order e_2 by assumption (iii) in the introduction. Therefore when n is sufficiently large, we may find $r_1(n)$ by finding a j which minimizes

$$\frac{\sum_{g,\text{ order } e_2}|[g]|\chi_j(g)\mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n))}{\dim\chi_j}.$$

Let j_1 be one such j, so that

$$j_1\in J_1:=\left\{j\in\{1,\dots,s\}: j \text{ minimizing } \left\lfloor\frac{\mathrm{m}_j(n)}{\dim\chi_j}\right\rfloor\right\}.$$

Thus, if we write $K_n^{(1)}$ in terms of irreducible representations of G, say

$$K_n^{(1)}=\mathrm{m}_1^{(1)}(n)M_1\oplus\cdots\oplus\mathrm{m}_s^{(1)}(n)M_s,$$

then the multiplicity functions for the non-free part have the following exact formula:

$$\mathrm{m}_i^{(1)}(n)=\mathrm{m}_i(n)-\left\lfloor\frac{\mathrm{m}_{j_1}(n)}{\dim\chi_{j_1}}\right\rfloor\dim\chi_i.$$

Now, when $i\in J_1$, we have

$$\left\lfloor\frac{\mathrm{m}_{j_1}(n)}{\dim\chi_{j_1}}\right\rfloor=\left\lfloor\frac{\mathrm{m}_i(n)}{\dim\chi_i}\right\rfloor$$

so that

$$\mathrm{m}_i^{(1)}(n)=\mathrm{m}_i(n)-\left\lfloor\frac{\mathrm{m}_i(n)}{\dim\chi_i}\right\rfloor\dim\chi_i\le\dim\chi_i.$$

On the other hand, when $i\notin J_1$, we get that

$$\mathrm{m}_i^{(1)}(n)\sim\mathrm{m}_i(n)-\frac{\mathrm{m}_{j_1}(n)}{\dim\chi_{j_1}}\dim\chi_i$$

so that

$$\mathrm{m}_i^{(1)}(n)\sim\frac{1}{|G|\dim\chi_{j_1}}\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C}}|[g]|f_i^{(1)}(g)c_g(n)$$

where

$$f_i^{(1)}(g):=\left(\chi_i(g)-\frac{\dim\chi_i}{\dim\chi_{j_1}}\chi_{j_1}(g)\right)\dim\chi_{j_1}.$$

Note that $f_i^{(1)}(e) = 0$ so that the dominant terms in the asymptotic formula for $\mathrm{m}_i^{(1)}(n)$ are the terms corresponding to the conjugacy classes of order e_2. More precisely, if h is an element of order e_2, then

$$\mathrm{m}_i^{(1)}(n) \sim \frac{C_{n,h}\exp(D_n/e_2)}{|G|\dim \chi_{j_1}} \sum_{[g],\text{ order } e_2} |[g]| f_i^{(1)}(g)\mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n))$$

and this proves Theorem 1.4.

The above computations show that $K_n^{(1)}$ tends to a multiple of the representation

$$L_2(n) := \bigoplus_{i \notin J_1} \left(\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_2} |[g]| f_i^{(1)}(g)\mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n)) \right) M_i$$

as $n \to \infty$.

By similar arguments, we can then write

$$K_n^{(1)} = r_2(n) L_2(n) \oplus K_n^{(2)}$$

where $r_2(n)$ is a nonnegative integer that is as large as possible, i.e.,

$$r_2(n) := \min_{j \notin J_1} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{\mathrm{m}_j^{(1)}(n)}{\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_2} |[g]| f_j^{(1)}(g)\mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n))} \right\rfloor \right\}.$$

Let J_2 be the collection of all $j \notin J_1$ which gives the minimum above. Then arguing as before, and using the asymptotics for $\mathrm{m}_j^{(1)}(n)$, we see that $K_n^{(2)}$ tends to a multiple of the representation

$$L_3(n) := \bigoplus_{i \notin J_1 \cup J_2} \left(\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_3} |[g]| f_i^{(2)}(g)\mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n)) \right) M_i$$

where

$$f_i^{(2)}(g) = \left(f_i^{(1)}(g) - \frac{\sum_{[h]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_2} |[h]| f_i^{(1)}(h)\mathrm{sgn}(c_h(n))}{\sum_{[h]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_2} |[h]| f_{j_2}^{(1)}(h)\mathrm{sgn}(c_h(n))} f_{j_2}^{(1)}(g) \right) \times \sum_{[h]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_2} |[h]| f_{j_2}^{(1)}(h)\mathrm{sgn}(c_h(n))$$

for any $j_2 \in J_2$.

For $l \geq 2$, once we have defined $\mathrm{m}_i^{(l-1)}$, $r_l(n)$, J_l, $f_i^{(l)}(g)$, $L_{l+1}(n)$, we may successively define the following:

- multiplicity function

$$\mathrm{m}_i^{(l)} := \mathrm{m}_i^{(l-1)} - r_l(n) \left(\sum_{[g]\in\mathcal{C},\text{ order } e_l} |[g]| f_j^{(l-1)}(g)\mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n)) \right)$$

- nonnegative integer-valued function

$$r_{l+1}(n) := \min_{j \notin J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_l} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{\mathrm{m}_j^{(l)}(n)}{\sum_{[g] \in \mathcal{C},\ \text{order } e_l} |[g]| f_j^{(l)}(g) \mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n))} \right\rfloor \right\}$$

- set J_{l+1} of all $j \notin J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_l$ that give rise to the minimum above
- class function

$$f_i^{(l+1)}(g) = \left(f_i^{(l)}(g) - \frac{\sum_{[h] \in \mathcal{C},\ \text{order } e_{l+1}} |[h]| f_i^{(l)}(h) \mathrm{sgn}(c_h(n))}{\sum_{[h] \in \mathcal{C},\ \text{order } e_{l+1}} |[h]| f_{j_{l+1}}^{(l)}(h) \mathrm{sgn}(c_h(n))} f_{j_{l+1}}^{(l)}(g) \right) \times \sum_{[h] \in \mathcal{C},\ \text{order } e_{l+1}} |[h]| f_{j_{l+1}}^{(l)}(h) \mathrm{sgn}(c_h(n))$$

  where $j_{l+1} \in J_{l+1}$
- representation of G

$$L_{l+2}(n) := \bigoplus_{i \notin J_1 \cup \cdots \cup J_{l+1}} \left(\sum_{[g] \in \mathcal{C},\ \text{order } e_l + 2} |[g]| f_i^{(l+1)}(g) \mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n)) \right) M_i.$$

This gives us the decomposition

$$K_n = r_1(n) L_1(n) \oplus r_2(n) L_2(n) \oplus \cdots \oplus r_t(n) L_t(n) \oplus L_\epsilon(n),$$

where the $L_j(n)$ are expressed in terms of fewer and fewer irreducible representations of G, and where $L_\epsilon(n)$ is a representation of G with bounded multiplicity functions. This proves Theorem 1.2.

4. Umbral Moonshine and Rademacher Sums

Let $\gamma \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and Γ a discrete subgroup of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$. A *harmonic Maass form of weight k on Γ with multiplier system ψ* is a real analytic function $F(\tau)$ satisfying the following properties:

(1) $F(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k \psi(\gamma) F(\tau)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$
(2) $\Delta_k F(\tau) = 0$ where Δ_k is the weight k hyperbolic Laplacian defined as

$$\Delta_k := -y^2 \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) + iky \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right)$$

(3) the singularities of $F(\tau)$, if any, are all located at the cusps of Γ
(4) there is a polynomial $P_F \in \mathbb{C}[q^{-1}]$ and $0 \leq \kappa < 1$ such that $F(\tau) - q^\kappa P_F(q^{-1}) = O(e^{-cy})$ as $y \to \infty$ for some $c > 0$, and similar conditions hold at the other cusps of Γ.

Let $k \geq 3/2$ and $H_{2-k}(\Gamma, \psi)$ be the collection of all harmonic Maass forms of weight $2 - k$ on Γ with multiplier system ψ. Let $F(\tau) \in H_{2-k}(\Gamma, \psi)$. Then the Fourier expansion of F at the cusp ρ of Γ has a natural decomposition of the form

$$F_\rho(\tau) = F_\rho^+(\tau) + F_\rho^-(\tau)$$

where $F_\rho^+(\tau)$ is holomorphic and $F_\rho^-(\tau)$ is non-holomorphic. A holomorphic function on $\mathbb{H}$ is said to be a *mock modular form* if it occurs as the holomorphic part of some harmonic Maass form [17, 20, 21].

The theory of Rademacher sums dates back to the 1930s when Rademacher established a conditionally convergent expression for $J(\tau)$ (in which $\Gamma = SL_2\mathbb{Z}$) by modifying a result of Poincaré [18]. Since then, this method has been generalized to other groups Γ and to other weights. Niebur constructed Rademacher sums for arbitrary Fuchsian subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ and arbitrary negative weights. [16]. Cheng and Duncan considered Niebur's method in weight $1/2$ and verified that it produces the functions appearing in Mathieu moonshine [5]. As such, Rademacher sums are regularized Poincaré series which give us convenient expressions for coefficients of modular and mock modular forms. More generally, in [2], Bringmann and Ono establish formulas for coefficients of harmonic Maass forms for non-positive weight and conditional results when the weight is $1/2$. We follow the notation of Cheng and Duncan [6]. We write $e(x)$ for $\exp(2\pi i x)$.

Let h be the width of Γ at ∞ and $\psi(T^h) = e(\kappa)$ where $0 \leq \kappa < 1$ and let μ be the minimum non-positive possibility such that $h\mu + \kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\psi : \Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ be a multiplier system of weight k. Define the index μ Rademacher sum of weight k to be

$$R^{[\mu]}_{\Gamma,\psi,k}(\tau) = \lim_{K\to\infty} \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_\infty\backslash\Gamma_{K,K^2}} e(\mu\gamma\tau) r^{[\mu]}_k \psi(\gamma)(c\tau + d)^{-2},$$

where $r^{[\mu]}_k$ is 1 if $k \geq 1$ or γ is upper triangular, and otherwise is defined by $r^{[\nu]}_k(\gamma, \tau) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-k)}\gamma(1-k, 2\pi i\mu(\gamma\tau - \gamma\infty))$ where $\gamma(s, x)$ is the lower incomplete Gamma function and

$$\Gamma_{K,K^2} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma |\ |c| < K, |d| < K^2 \right\}.$$

Rademacher sums are indexed by cosets of Γ_∞ in Γ. Their Fourier coefficients can be recovered by considering Rademacher series, indexed by $\Gamma_\infty\backslash\Gamma^X/\Gamma_\infty$. This time, $\mu < 0$ and $h\mu + \kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\nu < 0$ and $h\nu - \kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The Rademacher series $c_{\Gamma,\psi,k}(\mu, \nu)$ is defined as

$$c_{\Gamma,\psi,k}(\mu,\nu) = \frac{1}{h} \lim_{K\to\infty} \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_\infty\backslash\Gamma^X_K/\Gamma_\infty} K_{\gamma,\psi}(\mu,\nu) B_{\gamma,\psi}(\mu,\nu).$$

where

$$K_{\gamma,\psi}(\mu,\nu) = e\left(\mu\frac{a}{c}\right) e\left(\nu\frac{d}{c}\right) \psi(\gamma)$$

and

$$B_{\gamma,\psi}(\mu,\nu) = e\left(\frac{-k}{4}\right)(-\mu)^{\frac{(1-k)}{2}} \nu^{\frac{(k-1)}{2}} \frac{2\pi}{c} I_{|k-1|}\left(\frac{4\pi}{c}(-\mu\nu)^{1/2}\right)$$

for any weight $w \in \mathbb{R}$.

The relation between Rademacher sums and Rademacher series is as follows:

$$R^{[\mu]}_{\Gamma,\psi,k}(\tau) = q^\mu + \sum_{\substack{h\nu+\kappa\in\mathbb{Z} \\ \nu\geq 0}} c_{\Gamma,\psi,k}(\mu,\nu) q^\nu.$$

In general, a convergent Rademacher sum defines a mock modular form. In the case of Mathieu Moonshine, we have $\Gamma = \Gamma_0(n_g)$, for n_g the order of g, $k = 1/2$, $\kappa = 1/8$ which implies that $\mu = -1/8$ and $\nu = n - 1/8$, and $\psi = \epsilon^{-3}\rho_g$. Where ϵ is the multiplier system for the Dedekind η function and for each g, $\rho_g(\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)) =$

$e\left(-\frac{cd}{n_g h_g}\right)$ is a character specified by n_g and h_g, the minimal cycle length in the cycle shape of g. We get the following expression

$$c_{\Gamma_0(n_g),\rho_g\epsilon^{-3},\frac{1}{2}}\left(-\frac{1}{8}, n-\frac{1}{8}\right) =$$
$$-2\pi \sum_{\substack{c>0\\ 0\le d<c\\ (c,d)=1}} e\left(n\frac{d}{c}-\frac{3s(d,c)}{2}\right) e\left(-\frac{cd}{n_g h_g}\right) \frac{1}{c(8n-1)^{\frac{1}{4}}} I_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{2c}(8n-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Above we have used that

$$s(d,c)=\sum_{m=1}^{c-1}\frac{m}{c}\omega\left(\frac{md}{c}\right), \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(x)=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } x\in\mathbb{Z}\\ \lfloor x\rfloor-\frac{1}{2} & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

The mock modular form $H_g^{(M_{24})}$ are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}H_g^{(M_{24})}(\tau) &= -2R^{[-1/8]}_{\Gamma_0(n_g),\rho_g\epsilon^{-3},1/2}(\tau)\\ &= -2q^{-1/8}+2\sum_{n>0} c_{\Gamma_0(n_g),\rho_g\epsilon^{-3},\frac{1}{2}} q^{n-1/8}.\end{aligned}$$

As mentioned in the introduction, Cheng, Duncan, and Harvey's conjecture was motivated in part by the connections between the Monster and the Leech lattice and between the Mathieu group and another even, unimodular, positive-definite lattice of rank 24 [3]. There are 24 such lattices up to isomorphism, and Cheng, Duncan, and Harvey conjectured 22 further instances of moonshine. These groups arise from automorphism groups of the other even, unimodular, positive-definite, rank-24 lattices. More precisely: If N^X is a unimodular lattice corresponding to the Niemeier root system X, and W^X is the normal subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(N^X)$ generated by reflections in the roots, the umbral group of X is defined to be $G^X = \mathrm{Aut}(N^X)/W^X$ [10].

The umbral moonshine conjecture, proven in [10] states that for a Niemeier root system X and setting $m = m^X$ where m^X is the Coxeter number of any simple component of X, there is a naturally defined bi-graded infinite-dimensional representation of G^X

$$K^X = \bigoplus_{r\in I^X} \bigoplus_{\substack{D\in\mathbb{Z}, D\le 0\\ D=r^2 \pmod m}} K^X_{r,-D/4m}$$

such that the graded trace functions

$$H^X_{g,r}(\tau) = -2q^{-1/4m}\delta_{r,1} + \sum_{\substack{D\in\mathbb{Z}, D\le 0\\ D=r^2 \pmod m}} tr(g|K^X_{r,-D/4m})q^{-D/4m}$$

for $r \in I^X$ are components of *vector-valued* mock modular forms H^X_g. Here I^X depends on the types of components in the root system [10].

Similar to the Mathieu moonshine case, the vector-valued mock modular forms appearing in umbral moonshine, denoted $H_g^{(\ell)}$ for lambency ℓ, can also be conveniently expressed in terms of *vector-valued* Rademacher sums according to

$$H_g^{(\ell)} = -2R_{\Gamma_0(n_g),\psi^{(\ell)}\rho_g^{(\ell)},1/2}$$

which have similar asymptotics to the usual Rademacher sums [6, 10].

5. Proof of Corollary 1.5

From the Rademacher sum formulation in Section 4, we find that the nth coefficient of $H_g^{(M_{24})}$ is

$$c_g(n) = -4\pi \sum_{\substack{c>0 \\ 0\leq d<c \\ (c,d)=1}} e\left(n\frac{d}{c} - \frac{3s(d,c)}{2}\right) e\left(-\frac{cd}{n_g h_g}\right) \frac{1}{c(8n-1)^{\frac{1}{4}}} I_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{2c}(8n-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

From the asymptotics of the I-Bessel function

$$I_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \sim \frac{e^x}{\sqrt{2\pi x}},$$

and upon isolating the dominant term of this sum, we get

$$c_g(n) = \mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n)) \frac{4}{n_g^{1/2}\sqrt{8n-1}} \exp\left(\frac{\pi\sqrt{8n-1}}{2n_g}\right) + o\left(\exp\left(\frac{\pi\sqrt{8n-1}}{2n_g}\right)\right)$$

and so

$$C_n = \frac{4}{n_g^{1/2}\sqrt{8n-1}}, \qquad D_n = \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{8n-1}.$$

Also, from the Rademacher sum formulation, we find that $\mathrm{sgn}(c_{2A}(n)) = (-1)^n$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(c_{2B}(n)) = (-1)^{n+1}$. Thus, from the character table of M_{24}, the j that minimizes

$$\frac{\sum_{g,\ \text{order } e_2} |[g]| \chi_j(g) \mathrm{sgn}(c_g(n,r))}{\dim \chi_j}$$

is $j = 1$ when n is even, and $j = 2$ when n is odd. Thus Theorem 1.4 in this case becomes:

$$\mathrm{m}_i'(n) \sim (-1)^{n+1} \frac{2\sqrt{2}\, e^{\frac{\pi}{4}\sqrt{8n-1}}}{\sqrt{8n-1}} \left(\frac{|2A|}{|M_{24}|}\left(\chi_i(2A) - \frac{\chi_j(2A)}{\dim\chi_j}\dim\chi_i\right) - \frac{|2B|}{|M_{24}|}\left(\chi_i(2B) - \frac{\chi_j(2B)}{\dim\chi_j}\dim\chi_i\right)\right)$$

References

[1] Richard E. Borcherds. Monstrous moonshine and monstrous Lie superalgebras. *Invent. Math.*, 109(2):405–444, 1992.

[2] Kathrin Bringmann and Ken Ono. Coefficients of harmonic Maass forms. In *Partitions, q-series, and modular forms*, volume 23 of *Dev. Math.*, pages 23–38. Springer, New York, 2012.

[3] M. C. N. Cheng, J. F. R. Duncan, and J. A. Harvey. Umbral moonshine and the Niemeier lattices. *Res. Math. Sci.*, 1:Art. 3, 81, 2014.

[4] Miranda C. N. Cheng. $K3$ surfaces,$n = 4$ dyons and the Mathieu group M_{24}. *Commun. Number Theory Phys.*, 4(4):623–657, 2010.

[5] Miranda C. N. Cheng and John F. R. Duncan. On Rademacher sums, the largest Mathieu group and the holographic modularity of moonshine. *Commun. Number Theory Phys.*, 6(3):697–758, 2012.

[6] Miranda C. N. Cheng and John F. R. Duncan. Rademacher sums and Rademacher series. *arXiv:1210.3066*, 2015.

[7] J. H. Conway and S. P. Norton. Monstrous moonshine. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 11(3):308–339, 1979.

[8] John Conway, John McKay, and Abdellah Sebbar. On the discrete groups of Moonshine. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 132(8):2233–2240, 2004.

[9] John F. R. Duncan, Michael J. Griffin, and Ken Ono. Moonshine. *Res. Math. Sci.*, 2:Art. 11, 57, 2015.

[10] John F. R. Duncan, Michael J. Griffin, and Ken Ono. Proof of the umbral moonshine conjecture. *Research in the Mathematical Sciences*, 2:26, 2015.
[11] Tohru Eguchi and Kazuhiro Hikami. Note on twisted elliptic genus of $K3$ surface. *Phys. Lett. B*, 694(4-5):446–455, 2011.
[12] Matthias R. Gaberdiel, Stefan Hohenegger, and Roberto Volpato. Mathieu Moonshine in the elliptic genus of $K3$. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (10):062, 24, 2010.
[13] Matthias R. Gaberdiel, Stefan Hohenegger, and Roberto Volpato. Mathieu twining characters for $K3$. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (9):058, 20, 2010.
[14] T. Gannon. Much ado about Mathieu. *arXiv:1211.5531*, 2012.
[15] H. Larson. Coefficients of Mckay-Thompson series and distributions of the moonshine module. *arXiv:1508.03742*, 2015.
[16] Douglas Niebur. Construction of automorphic forms and integrals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 191:373–385, 1974.
[17] Ken Ono. Unearthing the visions of a master: harmonic Maass forms and number theory. In *Current developments in mathematics, 2008*, pages 347–454. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2009.
[18] Hans Rademacher. The Fourier Series and the Functional Equation of the Absolute Modular Invariant $J(\tau)$. *Amer. J. Math.*, 61(1):237–248, 1939.
[19] J. G. Thompson. Some numerology between the Fischer-Griess Monster and the elliptic modular function. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 11(3):352–353, 1979.
[20] Don Zagier. Ramanujan's mock theta functions and their applications (after Zwegers and Ono-Bringmann). *Astérisque*, (326):Exp. No. 986, vii–viii, 143–164 (2010), 2009. Séminaire Bourbaki. Vol. 2007/2008.
[21] S. P. Zwegers. Mock θ-functions and real analytic modular forms. In *q-series with applications to combinatorics, number theory, and physics (Urbana, IL, 2000)*, volume 291 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 269–277. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001.

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Emory University
E-mail address: victor.manuel.aricheta@emory.edu

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Emory University
E-mail address: lea.beneish@emory.edu